

SECOND DIALOGUE

Between a New

Catholick Convert

AND A

PROTESTANT.

Shewing why he cannot believe the Doctrine of

Transubstantiation.

Though he do firmly believe the Doctrine

Of the Trinity.

[Rev. Richard Kinder]

L O N D O N,

Printed for B. Aylmer, at the Three Pigeons
against the Royal Exchange in Cornhill. 1687.

IMPRIMATUR.

Decemb. 3.
1686.

Guil. Needham.

A

Second Dialogue

Between a new

CATHOLICK CONVERT

AND A

Protestant, &c.

A. SIR, I much rejoyce to meet you thus happily,
and I hope I find you at leisure.

B. I am not onely at leisure, but very much disposed to discourse with you farther of that matter which you commended to my consideration when we were last together.

A. And I hope you have duly considered it; if you have done so, I make no doubt but you are of my mind.

B. I do not find in my self any inclination so prevailing as that which I have towards truth; and you will believe me when I tell you that in matters of this nature I am not likely to be drawn from it by any worldly interest. I have the indifference of a Traveller, and desire nothing but to find the right way to Heaven.

A. This persuasion I have had of you always; and as this disposition to embrace the truth, where ever it is, well becomes an honest mind, so I do not fear but you are by this time convinced, that when you believe the Doctrine of the *Holy Trinity*, you cannot reject

A 2

the

the belief of the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; For you remember that this is the question that we disputed on when we met last.

B. You are very right when you say that was the question between us. And I do very well remember

that you used these very words; *As these two*
Pag. 2. *Doctrines have equal ground from Scripture,*

Reason and Tradition; so is there the same
obligation of your receiving the one as well as the other.

I do freely own that I believe the *H. Trinity*, and that I do not believe the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; and therefore do not think my self obliged to believe the one because I believe the other. And, if you please to give me the hearing I will frankly tell you why I cannot believe the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* true, and then I'll give you my reasons why, though I do believe the *Holy Trinity*, I do not think my self obliged for the same reason to believe your Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*.

A. As to the first of these you may I conceive spare your pains. I desire not to hear your reasons against that Doctrine of the Catholick Church. 'Tis the other matter you are most concerned in, viz. to give good reason why you do not believe the one as well as the other. But I give you liberty to proceed in your own way.

B. I shall be very brief as to the first of these, and onely touch upon some things that do absolutely hinder me from believing this Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. Nothing is more certain than that this Doctrine destroys the evidence of Sense, and consequently subverts our whole Religion. We cannot be certain of the truth of the Miracles which *Jesus* did, nor of his Resurrection, if our senses are not to be credited even then when the object of them is at a due distance, and the medium and organ rightly disposed, and all other requi-
sites

(5)
quittes in due order. And by the very same reason I be-
lieve this Doctrine true I may suspect the rest of the Re-
ligion. In a word, it seems to me to be a manifest
fallshood, and nothing can be more certainly and ma-
nifestly true than this is manifestly false: And you are
in vain attempt to prove any of your Doctrines from
the Bible, when, according to this Doctrine, I may
not trust my Eyes, and may as well deny that there
is any such place of Scripture which you allege, as
you can affirm the truth of this Doctrine; against the
evidence of sense. Besides it labours with difficulties
and absurdities that are insupportable.

A. But we are not to reject a Doctrine because it is
attended with some considerable difficulties, for then
we may reject that of the *Holy Trinity*, and of the *In-
carnation*, and *Resurrection of our Bodies*. And there
are great difficulties in the account of the genealogy of
Jesur by *St. Matthew* and *St. Luke*, and yet I presume
you believe these Doctrines, and do not question the
truth of either Evangelist how inconsistent soever they
may seem to be one with another.

B. Mistake me not, Sir, I am far from thinking
that we are to reject those Doctrines which are attend-
ed with great difficulties: But yet we are certain that
a Doctrine cannot be true, which if it were allowed so
to be, would subvert the whole Religion, and leave
nothing certain or true but it self; nor leave us any
evidence that it self is true.

A. Let me intreat you to speak to the main point,
that is, give me your reasons why when you believe
the Doctrine of the *Holy Trinity* you should reject this
of *Transubstantiation*; for if this be attended with great
difficulties, so is the other.

B. This I will readily do, but must tell you again
that I do not reject any Doctrine because of the
difficulties attending on it.

(8)
A. Assign then the reasons why when you do believe the *Trinity*, you deny that Doctrine which hath *Equal Ground* for it from *Scripture, Reason and Tradition*.

A. I can by no means grant that it hath *Equal Ground*. And I will therefore give you the reasons which you demand. *And

First. The Doctrine of the *Trinity* is revealed in the *Scripture*, in this both sides are agreed: The other Doctrine is not revealed, so the *Protestant* *Salmeron* *Do.* *stants* with one consent affirm: And indeed those of your Church grant that the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is not evidently revealed in Holy Writ. *Scotus* *cap. 23.* affirms, as *Bellarmin* confesseth (and thinks his opinion not altogether improbable) that *Transubstantiation* cannot be evidently proved from any express *Scripture*. Now the Fathers of the Council of *Nice* urge the Text of H. Writ against the *Arians*. But the Church of *Rome* maintains their Doctrine upon another bottom, and that is the authority and declaration of the Church.

A. But do we not bring Texts of *Scripture* for the proof of this Doctrine?

B. That you do frequently, but then the greater and wiser of your Divines will not lay the stress of the cause upon *Scripture*. I except out of *Consens. ver.* this number Mr. *Sclater* of *Putney*, who *pag. 20.* is for the literal sense of those words, *This is my Body*, because the nature of a last Will and Testament requires it should be so. But, alas! he considers not what follows, where 'tis said in these words of this last Will and Testament, that the Cup is the New Testament of his Blood, where he will be forced to acknowledge a figure or two. But he that can prove *Transubstantiation* from the *Rabbins*, may be allowed a greater liberty than other men think fit to take.

A. Have

A. Have you any other reason to alledge why you do not, when you believe the *Trinity*, believe the Doctrine also?

B. I have, and having shewed that your Doctrine hath not equal ground from *Scripture*, I add

Secondly, That it hath not equal ground from *Reason*. 'Tis certain, and hath been abundantly made good that your Doctrine contradicts right Reason: It involves a heap of contradictions: It supposeth a change of substance when the accidents remain, that these accidents should nourish, or destroy: That the same body should be in many places at once, broken and whole at the same time; that a whole body should be in a point; that every wafer should be the whole body, and yet the body be but one. That a thing can be divided into wholes. I forbear to name much more to the same purpose. The Doctrine of the *Trinity* is indeed above our reason and comprehension, but you will not say 'tis against it. Besides 'tis revealed, and 'tis reasonable to believe what God says. Besides we are better able to judge the nature of bodies (upon which account we reject your Doctrine as manifestly false) than of the spiritual and incomprehensible nature of God. We reject not what our reason does not comprehend. But shall we therefore believe what is a contradiction to all the reason of mankind? And because we do not comprehend the sublime nature of God, may we not rely upon our senses when they are employed on their proper objects?

A. Have you any other reason why you reject *Transubstantiation*, when you believe the *Trinity*?

B. Having shewed that your Doctrine hath not Equal Ground from *Scripture* and *Reason*, I add, that it hath not,

Thirdly, Equal ground from *Authority*. Indeed you produced none at all, and therefore I need not cite any

in

...the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, as they are in
the mystery of the Holy Trinity. It will be hard to re-
concile this concession with what you affirmed a little
above, that these two Doctrines have Equal ground from
Tradition. But he that believes the Doctrine it self,
need not be able to say, that not half so much is yet
Equal ground. 'Tis true you pretend to give a good
reason why the Fathers are not half so express in the
one as in the other. Because, *Transubstantiation* hath
not been a Doctrine so long in dispute, and 'tis not Cu-
sary for men to argue unquestionable truths. I do easily
believe it hath not been so long in dispute; no-
thing being heard of in the primitive and best times.
And 'tis easier to suppose it an unquestionable truth than
to prove it to have been professed at all. But this is
to beg and not to prove the question.

I will add no more reasons, though I might easily
do it, because I am for brevity as well as you. I have
abundantly shewed that these two Doctrines have not
Equal ground from Scripture, Reason and Tradition,
and that there is not the same obligation to receive one
as the other.

And thus, Sir, though I cannot acquiesce in what you
say, yet I heartily thank you for your good Prayer,
and beg you would join with me in repeating it in
behalf of all Christians. *God give us his Holy Spirit to
instruct us.*

F I N I S.

